



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/671,269	09/24/2003	Scott A. Van Gundy	23215-07991	6540

758 7590 09/06/2006

FENWICK & WEST LLP  
SILICON VALLEY CENTER  
801 CALIFORNIA STREET  
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041

EXAMINER

ESCALANTE, OVIDIO

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2614

DATE MAILED: 09/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 10/671,269	Applicant(s) VAN GUNDY, SCOTT A.	
	Examiner Ovidio Escalante	Art Unit 2614	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 June 2006.  
 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.  
     4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are allowed.  
 6) ☒ Claim(s) 5-15 is/are rejected.  
 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
     a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
         1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
         2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
         3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
     \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to applicant's response filed on June 23, 2006. **Claims 1-15** are now pending in the present application.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 5-10 and 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Shaffer US Patent 6,002,751.

**Regarding claim 5**, Shaffer teaches a method for distributing voice mail messages, (abstract; fig. 3), the method comprising:

determining, at a first server (16,18), whether a second server is available, (col. 4, line 60-col. 5, line 25); and

responsive to determining that the second server (56,58) is available, (col. 5, lines 2-23);

retrieving a voice mail message from the first server, (col. 4, lines 40-47); and

sending the voice mail message to the second server, (col. 4, lines 46-49).

**Regarding claim 6**, Shaffer, as applied to claim 5, teaches querying a configuration module for a location of the second server, (col. 4, lines 23-30).

**Regarding claim 7**, Shaffer, as applied to claim 5, teaches responsive to determining that the second server is available, (col. 4, lines 46-49);

receiving, by the second server, the voice mail message, (col. 4, lines 46-49); and

Art Unit: 2614

storing, by the second server, the voice mail message, (col. 5, lines 1-11; fig. 3).

**Regarding claim 8**, Shaffer teaches an apparatus for receiving, storing and distributing voice mail messages, (abstract; fig. 3), the apparatus comprising:

a call status module, configured to determine whether a call should be transferred to voice mail, (col. 3, lines 28-50);

a call transfer module, configured to determine a call's voice mail extension and a server on which the voice mail extension resides, (col. 4, lines 23-37); and

a voice mail migration module, configured to send a voice mail message to a remote server, (col. 4, lines 46-49).

**Regarding claim 9**, Shaffer, as applied to claim 8, teaches the call transfer module is further configured to determine whether the server on which the voice mail extension resides is a remote server, (col. 4, lines 23-37; fig. 1, fig. 3).

**Regarding claim 10**, Shaffer, as applied to claim 8, teaches a storage interface module, configured to allow modules to store and retrieve data, (col. 3, line 66-col. 4, line 22).

**Regarding claim 12**, Shaffer, as applied to claim 8, teaches a telephony application programming interface module, configured to allow module access to data on a switch, (col. 3, lines 28-65).

**Regarding claim 13**, Shaffer, as applied to claim 8, teaches a configuration module, configured to provide information about remote servers, (col. 3, lines 28-65).

**Regarding claim 14**, Shaffer, as applied to claim 8, teaches an extension library module, configured to provide common functions that are used by modules, (col. 3, lines 28-65).

Art Unit: 2614

**Regarding claim 15**, Shaffer teaches a system for receiving, storing, and distributing voice mail messages, (abstract; figs. 1 and 3), the system comprising:

a first apparatus for receiving, storing, and distributing voice mail messages, (col. 3, lines 28-50), the first apparatus comprising:

a first call status module, configured to determine whether a first call should be transferred to voice mail, (col. 3, lines 28-50);

a first call transfer module, configured to determine a first call's voice mail extension and a first sever on which the first voice mail extension resides, (col. 4, lines 23-35); and

a first voice mail migration module, configured to send a first voice mail message to a first remote server, (col. 3, lines 28-50; fig. 3); and

a second apparatus for receiving, storing and distributing voice mail messages, (col. 5, lines 12-34), the second apparatus comprising:

a second call status module, configured to determine whether a second call should be transferred to voice mail, (col. 3, lines 28-50; fig. 3);

a second call transfer module, configured to determine a second call's voice mail extension and a second server on which the second voice mail extension resides, (col. 4, lines 24-35; fig. 3); and

a second voice mail migration module, configured to send a second voice mail message to a second remote server, (col. 4, lines 24-38; fig. 3);

wherein the first apparatus and the second apparatus are coupled to each other, (fig 1).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaffer in view of Sherwood US Patent 6,542,584.

***Regarding claim 11***, Shaffer, as applied to claim 8, does not specifically teach of an encoding/decoding module configured to convert audio voice message to a data format, however the Examiner believes that it would have been obvious if not inherent that Shaffer would have an audio encoding/decoding module since it was well known in the art for voice mail systems to take analog voice from the sending party and store the analog voice as digital data.

Nonetheless, Sherwood teaches an audio encoding/decoding module, configured to convert audio voice mail messages to a data format suitable for storage and to convert voice mail messages from this storage data format to an audio format, (col. 3, lines 26-49).

Art Unit: 2614

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Shaffer by including an encoding/decoding module as taught by Sherwood so that messages can be stored as digital data which will thus allow less space to be occupied in the message storage.

***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments filed June 23, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

***Regarding claim 5:***

Applicant contends that Shaffer does not disclose, teach or suggest the claimed element “responsive to determine that the second server is available...sending the voice mail message to the second server.” since the determination is based upon inputs from the user and not based on determining whether the remote voice mail system is available. The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Shaffer teaches in col. 4 and fig. 3 of sending voice mail messages to a remote voice mail system 56. In col. 5 and fig. 4, Shaffer teaches the system responds to a condition when the remote voice mail system is unavailable. The condition allows for the voice mail message to be stored in the local voice mail server if the remote voice mail server does not pick up. Therefore, since Shaffer teaches in col. 4, of transferring the messages to the remote server, then it inherently determines that it is available since it will not initiate the fig. 4 process unless the remote server is unavailable.

Art Unit: 2614

***Regarding claims 8 and 15:***

Applicant contends that Shaffer does not disclose, teach or suggest the claimed element “a call transfer module, configured to determine a call’s voice mail extension and a server on which the voice mail extension resides..” since Shaffer does not disclose whether the voice mail system includes multiple server and, as a result, also does not disclose determining a server on which a voice mail extension resides. The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

In col. 4, lines 24+, Shaffer teaches the message delivery telephone number for the remote voice mail system is determined and received by the local call processor. Hence it is clear from this paragraph that a call’s server is determined on which the voice mail extension resides. The call’s voice mail extension is also determined since Shaffer teaches of calling the call’s extension to deliver the message, as shown in col. 5, lines 1-11. Therefore, Shaffer meets each claimed limitation as currently claimed.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

8. Claims 1-4 are allowed.

***Conclusion***

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37



Art Unit: 2614

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(571) 273-7537, (for informal or draft communications, please label  
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:

Customer Service Window  
Randolph Building  
401 Dulany Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ovidio Escalante whose telephone number is 571-272-7537. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th from 6:30AM to 4:00PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan S. Tsang can be reached on 571-272-7547. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

Art Unit: 2614

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

**OVIDIO ESC.  
PATENT EXAMINER**

*Ovidio Escalante*

Ovidio Escalante  
Primary Patent Examiner  
Group 2645  
August 25, 2006

O.E./oe